College of Engineering Committee on Academic Affairs  
Meeting Minutes 8 September 2016

Meeting called to order at 1:30pm by committee chair, John Lenhart  
A quorum was present

**Voting members present:**

- AAE  Sandra Metzler  
- AVN  Seth Young  
- BME  Mark Ruegsegger  
- CBE  Jeff Chalmers  
- CIV  Frank Croft  
- CSE  Paul Sivilotti  
- ECE  George Valco  
- EED  Deb Grzybowski  
- ENG PHY  Robert Perry  
- ENV  John Lenhart  
- FAB  Ann Christy  
- ISE  Carolyn Sommerich  
- ME  Sandra Metzler  
- WLD  Dave Farson  
- Grad Students  Sheena Marston and Alaine Wetli  
- UG Students  CJ Ha and Chelsea Vretenar

**Voting members not present:**

- MSE  Mike Sumption

**Non-voting members present:**

- Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education  Dave Tomasko  
- Committee Secretary  Rosie Quinzon-Bonello  
- KSA  Jane Murphy  
- Advisor  Nikki Strader

Guests  None

1. Introductions

2. Motion to approve meeting minutes from 16 May 2016 as written.  
   2.1. Move to accept and seconded  
   2.2. No discussion  
   2.3. Vote taken: 15 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. (1 vote for both ME and AERO; for student representatives one vote per student group represented.)  
   2.4. Motion passed
3. John Lenhart introduce for discussion to allow one faculty member to represent the Mechanical and Aerospace programs rather than two. Currently there are two members – one per program.
   3.1. Each member had received a copy of CCAA Responsibilities for review
      3.1.1. John Lenhart interpreted that each program should have one member.
      3.1.2. A comment was made that there needed to be a discussion how this would effect EED.
      3.1.3. The committee secretary was charged with looking at minutes from last year’s CCAA minutes regarding EED’s vote and membership.
      3.1.4. George Valco commented that he was quite certain that this had already been done.
      3.1.5. Sandra Metzler added that the reason for the request is logistical. Both MECHENG and AEROENG are well aligned.
      3.1.6. A comment was made that the curricula are different and therefore should have two representatives.
      3.1.7. A comment was made that 1 vote for two programs would be unfair to the smaller program.
      3.1.8. A comment was made that perhaps smaller programs in the 1 vote for two program proposal internally handle issues prior to meetings.
      3.1.9. Dave Tamasko commented that there needs to be a clause clarifying memberships and voting rights.
      3.1.10. Rosie Quinzon-Bonello suggested that she call Ed McCaul for clarification.
      3.1.11. Due to the uncertainty, it was decided that the motion be tabled until more information is gathered and presented at the next meeting.

4. The committee was informed that the committee secretary had approved course change requests for several courses. The committee secretary referred to the committee the list of course change requests and xx94 approved during the summer.
   4.1. Carolyn Sommerich requested that the committee be provided with a list similar to that was distributed in the past, and told the committee secretary that she will send her a sample. The Committee Secretary will provide the same list with the required information at the next meeting.

5. Mark Ruegsegger, as chair of Subcommittee B, provided an update to the proposed CEGE curriculum changes presented during last May’s meeting. During this meeting in May, CCAA sent back a list of questions to CEGE. Handouts of the responses to these questions were provided to the committee. Of the 7 proposed changes, #s 1,3,4,7 were straightforward and minor, and that the topics that were earmarked for discussions were #s 2,5,6. (i.e. introduction of a new required course CIVILENG 2405; the replacement of required course Physics 1251 with a science elective, and the addition of an additional science elective course such as Biology 1114, Chemistry 1220, Physics 1251).
   5.1. Frank Croft provided the history of ENGR 4410.01 and ENGR 4410.02. It was not the intention that the proposed new course CIVILENG 2405 replace ENGR 4410.0x; however, EED wanted to stop offering ENGR 4410.0x in 2017. A 1 credit hour on-line course such as the proposed CEGE course cannot replace a course like ENGR 4410.0x. The elimination of ENGR 4410 and the creation of CIVILENG 2405 should be considered separately.
   5.2. Ann Christy said that FABE wants ENGR 4410.0x to remain, and that if EED should decide to stop offering this course, FABE would offer it. There is a high demand in FABE now.
5.3. Suggestions that ENGR 4410.0x should be made more robust and thereby increase its credit hours.

5.4. A comment was made that would require an additional class meeting.

5.5. The discussion of the other CEGE responses ensued - the elimination of Physics 1251 from the curriculum. Given the responses provided by CEGE, it was felt that it made sense that deleting Physics 1251 (5 credit hours) from the CEGE curriculum and replacing it with an additional science credit. One hour of the 5 credits will be devoted to the new course proposed, CIVILENG 2405.

5.6. The comment was made that the list of additional science classes provided included only one 4 credit hour class. The other courses are 5. In order to remain credit neutrality, the choice of additional sciences classes would have to be 4 credit hour courses. Among the additional science courses listed, only biology has 4 credit hours, the remaining courses (Chemistry 1220 and Physics 1250) have 5 credit hours. If students took one of the other two courses, they would be taking more credit hours than needed to satisfy the Additional Science Elective requirements.

5.7. The question was asked whether Civil was ready to make a recommendation. The response was that Civil was not yet ready.

5.8. It was decided that the CEGE proposal be tabled until the next meeting and that Subcommittee B would look into this.

6. Dave Tomasko provided an update on Academic Affairs.

6.1. A handout listing in table format the categories and criteria for Academic Certificate Programs, Certificate of Completion Programs, and Certification Programs at OSU was distributed to faculty. The request was made that committee members take this list back to their respective G and UG curriculum committees. The handout clarified what the university recognizes. This is the final approved document on certificates.

6.2. UG enrollment # for the 16-17 academic year = 7700, which is larger than expected. This is the first year that 2nd year students are required to live in the dorms.

6.3. Students who are not directly enrolled in COE are using Physics as a “backdoor” way into the UG ENGR program.

6.4. Students who decide to move out of ENGR are balanced by those who come in, but the number of credit hours they have at the time they enter COE is less than 40 credit hours.

6.5. An analysis detailing such trends will be provided at the next meeting.

6.6. EAB project aka “On Course” is primarily a tool for advisors to proactively work with students. This project will be rolled out in bits and pieces during the spring.

6.7. The committee was asked for feedback on their experience with Carmen/Canvas, as there was some trouble during the beginning of the semester. Several committee members voiced frustration with editing and adding students.

6.8. GE curriculum will be going through a major review in the near future.

6.9. The Core Committee will be reviewing a new charge and mission. As an FYI, the new charge was distributed to the committee.

7. The meeting was adjourned at 3:00pm.